

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/804,093	SCOTT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Humera N. Sheikh	1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Humera N. Sheikh. (3) _____.

(2) Ken Lenke. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 & 16 March 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: proposed claims 63 & 64.

Identification of prior art discussed: no.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner discussed newly proposed claim 63, which is claim 57, rewritten in independent form. After a review with her Supervisor, T.K.Page, the Examiner informed Attorney that the coatings listed in Applicants' specification at page 6, lines 22-28 would provide for enteric properties not seen in conventional coatings and were therefore critical and as a result should be incorporated in newly proposed claim 63. Attorney proposed a limitation to recite the term "enteric" coating in line 9 of claim 63 and also to formulate a new dependent claim 64 to recite the markush grouping of enteric coatings listed in specification at page 6. Examiner consulted Supervisor Page who agreed to Applicant's proposed suggestion. Examiner agreed to do an Examiner's Amendment making the following additions: (1) To add the term "an enteric" before the word 'coating' in line 9 of claim 63 and (2) To formulate new dependent claim 64 reciting the markush group of enteric coatings listed in specification at page 6.